

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and further examination in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. By the foregoing amendments, claims 1,2, 4, 8, 12-15 and 17 have been amended.

Specification

In the Office Action, the title of the application was objected to as not being descriptive. By the foregoing amendments, a new title has been provided.

Interview Summary

The undersigned thanks Examiner Wang for the courtesy extended during the telephonic interview conducted on February 25, 2009. During that interview, claim 1 and the rejections under Section 103 were discussed. The rejection under Section 112 was also discussed. The potential lack of definition of the term “corrupted” was discussed. That term is no longer used in the independent claims.

Adding the limitations of claim 2 into claim 1 was discussed. By the foregoing amendments, the limitations of claim 2 have been added into independent claim 12.

Rejections Under Section 112

In the Office Action, claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph, based upon the use of the term “it” in independent claims 1, 12 and 15. By the foregoing amendments, each occurrence of “it” in those independent claims has been replaced by a term with antecedent basis. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections under Section 112 is earnestly solicited.

Rejections Under Section 103

In the Office Action, claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moshfeghi* (U.S. Patent No. 6,076,166) in view of *Ji* (U.S. Patent No. 5,623,600). During a telephone call, the Examiner stated that the references to *McLaughlin*

(U.S. Patent No. 5,636,139) in the body of the rejections was a typographical error. Applicant respectfully submits that the amended claims are patentable over the references of record. Although the following remarks focus primarily on independent claim 1, they apply with equal force to each of the rejected claims.

Amended claim 1 is directed to a method of assuring the quality of data being transmitted by a server of a data provider (e.g., a website) in response to a client request. Embodiments of the claimed invention assure the quality of data being published at a website by verifying that only “correct” data is transmitted to clients. Each of the independent claims has been amended to include “defining a correct state of a collection of data that may be requested by clients.” (claim 1) The independent claims have been further amended to clarify that the quality assurance procedure that is carried out determines whether the requested data (from within the collection of data) “has been modified from said correct state in order to assure the quality of said obtained client requested data.” (claim 1) None of the cited references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest such a method.

As has been acknowledged in the Office Action, *Moshfeghi* fails to teach the last three elements of claim 1. In the office action *Ji* was pointed to as making those three elements obvious. Specifically, *Ji* was characterized as teaching virus scanning on requested data prior to the file transferring and transferring the file to the recipient if it does not contain a virus and deleting the file if it does contain a virus. (*Ji* Abstract.) However, that teaching of *Ji* does not overcome the shortcomings of *Moshfeghi*. Additionally, the combination of *Ji* and *Moshfeghi* also do not make the amended independent claims obvious.

For example, amended claim 1 now includes the limitation of “defining a correct state of a collection of data that may be requested by clients.” *Ji* and *Moshfeghi* have no teaching or suggestion of such a step. *Ji* teaches virus scanning as a “quality assurance” process. (See, e.g., *Ji* Col. 7, lines 58- 63) Such virus scanning typically includes analyzing a file for the presence of patterns that are found in known viruses. It does not utilize a definition of a correct state of data that may be requested by clients. Neither *Ji* nor *Moshfeghi* define a correct state for data which can be requested by clients.

Similarly, claim 1 includes performing a quality assurance procedure on the requested data to “indicate whether said obtained client requested data has been modified from said correct state.” *Ji* (and *Moshfeghi*) have no teaching or suggestion of a method with such an element. In fact because *Ji* is virus scanning email messages (among other types of files), *Ji* could not know what a correct state for such a file would be.

Independent claim 12 includes similar limitations and is patentable over the references of record for at least those reasons. In addition, claim 12 has been further amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 2. Such a further limitation is also not taught or suggested by the references of record.

Independent claim 15 is directed to a system. It includes limitations similar to the limitations discussed above in connection with claim 1 and is patentable over the references of record for at least those reasons.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections under §103.

CONCLUSION

The Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner’s concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, amendments to the claims, the reasons therefor, and arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claim set are presented above. In light of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is specifically requested. If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the

Examiner is respectfully requested to initiate the same with the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 12, 2009



Richard E. Campbell
Reg. No. 34,790

PROCOPIO, CORY, HARGREAVES & SAVITCH LLP

530 B Street, Suite 2100
San Diego, California 92101-4469
(619) 238-1900 (Phone)
(619) 235-0398 (Fax)
Customer No. 27189